

### **Remarks**

This Supplemental Amendment is submitted in response to the Advisory Action dated June 20, 2006 and assumes entry of the prior Amendment dated June 1, 2006 and received in the Patent Office on June 5, 2006.

The Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's helpful comments concerning an apparent inconsistency between Claim 1 and previously amended Claim 29. The Applicants have accordingly further amended Claim 29 to remove any apparent inconsistency.

The Applicants agree with the Examiner's helpful comment that Claim 1 requires the presence of zinc powder in the film. The purpose of Claim 29 is to recite other materials that may also be included in the film as additives to the zinc powder. This is described in Paragraph [0073] of the Applicants' Specification, for example, wherein the Applicants state that the film may contain components other than the sacrificial corrosion-resistant metal powder, (which is zinc in the case of Claim 1). Those additional components may include epoxy resin, a drying agent, hardening agent, plasticizer, dispersant and emulsifier as recited in Paragraphs [0073] and [0075], for example.

Thus, the Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1 now recites a corrosion-resistant film containing metal powder (which is zinc) and Claim 29 now recites a corrosion-resistant film containing epoxy resin, a drying agent, hardening agent, plasticizer, a dispersant and an emulsifier.

The amendment made by the Applicants in this Supplemental Response, namely the removal of the word "primarily" allows for situations wherein the zinc powder may be present in an amount of about 60% by volume, for example, but the film can also contain epoxy resin and the other components in a lesser amount. The Applicants therefore believe that this removes any

uncertainty as to the meaning of Claim 29 and places it in conformance with the spirit of Claim 1 as well. Thus, the Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 29 is in condition for allowance. In the event that the Examiner has any additional questions concerning the intent and/or the precise language of Claim 29, the Applicants would be more than happy to discuss the matter at the Examiner's convenience by telephone.

In light of the foregoing, the Applicants respectfully submit that both this Supplemental Response and the previous Amendment place the entire application in due condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



T. Daniel Christenbury  
Reg. No. 31,750  
Attorney for Applicants

TDC/as  
(215) 656-3381